

PATENT  
ATTORNEY DOCKET No. 27459-803/121

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent of:

MOURA et al.

Patent No. 5,586,121

Application No. 08/426,920

Patentee: Hybrid Networks, Inc.

Filed: April 21, 1995

Issued: December 17, 1996

For: ASYMMETRIC HYBRID  
ACCESS SYSTEM AND  
METHOD

Certificate of Correction Branch  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 255 and 37 CFR § 1.323

Patentee respectfully requests a Certificate of Correction to correct obvious errors in this Patent. These errors are of a clerical nature and are of minor character, and occurred in good faith.

Proposed changes to the claims are on the attached form PTO-1050. Patentee respectfully submits that each of these changes reflects Patentee's obvious intent. In line 21 of

03/11/1998 GPO:TMEX 00000003 DAB:060115 5586121  
Sale Ref: 00000009 DAB: 060115 5586121  
01 FC:145 100.00 CH

claim 7 of the printed patent, there is a period after "manager." There is additional text ending with a period, however, between the period in line 21 and the beginning of claim 8. Thus, Patentee respectfully submits that the period in line 21 of claim 7 was obviously intended to be a comma.

In lines 10-11 of claim 11 of the printed patent, there is a recitation of "controlling the downstream and upstream in interactive network sessions . . ." Previously in the claim, however, "downstream" and "upstream" are only used as modifiers: "downstream information" (line 5), "upstream channel" (line 8), and "downstream channel" (lines 8-9). Thus, Patentee respectfully submits that the recitation in lines 10-11 of claim 11 was obviously intended to be --controlling the downstream and upstream channels in interactive network sessions . . .--

In line 18 of claim 13, there is a recitation of "said host server." There is no antecedent "a host server" but there is an antecedent "a server" in line 1. Throughout claim 13 ( lines 7-8, 11, 14, 22, and 25) all other references are to "server" instead of "host server." Dependent claims 17, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 37, and 38 also recite "server" instead of "host server." Thus, Patentee respectfully submits that the recitation in line 18 of claim 13 was obviously intended to be -said server-.

In lines 27-28 of claim 13, there is a recitation of "said shared media." There is no antecedent "a shared media" but there is an antecedent "a shared medium" in line 8, and there are recitations of "said shared medium" in dependent claims 20, 23, 25, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and

36. Thus, Patentee respectfully submits that the recitation in line 27-28 of claim 13 was obviously intended to be -said shared medium-.

Line 1 of claim 46 begins "The network communication system . . ." Claim 46, however, is an independent claim. Thus, Patentee respectfully submits that the recitation on line 1 was obviously intended to be -A network communication system . . -

In lines 25-28 of claim 57, there is a recitation "further including a backbone interface . . . , a downstream router . . ." Thus, Patentee respectfully submits that, to grammatically connect the two clauses, the comma on line 26 should be -and-.

In lines 28-29 of claim 57, there is a recitation of "said shared media." There is no antecedent "a shared media" but there is an antecedent "a shared medium" in line 10 and there are recitations of "said shared medium" in claim 57 in line 10, and line 18. Thus, Patentee respectfully submits that the recitation in line 28-29 of claim 57 was obviously intended to be -said shared medium-.

In lines 25 of claim 58, there is a recitation of "said shared media." There is no antecedent "a shared media" but there is an antecedent "a shared medium" in line 10 and there are recitations of "said shared medium" in claim 58 in line 16. Thus, Patentee respectfully submits that the recitation in line 25 of claim 58 was obviously intended to be -said shared medium-.

In accordance with 37 CFR § 1.20 (a), please charge the required fee of \$100.00 to Farkas & Manelli PLLC Deposit Account No. 06-0115. If there are any fees required for consideration

of this document, or for any other reason, please charge such fees to the Farkas & Manelli, PLLC  
Deposit Account No. 06-0115.

Respectfully submitted,

FARKAS & MANELLI, PLLC

By Jerome D. Jackson  
Jerome D. Jackson  
Reg. No. 33,186  
Tel: (202) 778-1130  
Fax: (202) 887-0336

Farkas & Manelli PLLC  
1233 20th Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036

Dated: 1/14/98

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
**CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION**

PATENT NO. : 5,586,121  
DATED : Dec. 17, 1996  
INVENTOR(S) : Moura et al.

It is certified that error appears in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent is hereby corrected as shown below:

In claim 7, line 21, after "manager" change ":" to -,-. *p*

In claim 11, line 11, after "upstream", insert -channels-. *a*

In claim 13, line 18, change "said host server" to -said server-; and *a*  
line 28, change "said shared media" to -said shared medium-. *a*

In claim 46, line 1, change "The" to "A". *a*

In claim 57, line 26, change "," to -and-; and *a*  
line 29, change "media" to -medium-. *a*

In claim 58, line 25, change "media" to -medium-. *a*

MAILING ADDRESS OF SENDER:

Farkas & Manelli PLLC  
1233 20th Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036

PATENT NO. 5,586,121

No. of add'l copies  
@ 50¢ per page



## NOTICE RE: CERTIFICATES OF CORRECTION

Paper No. 23

DATE : 3-12-98  
TO : Supervisor, Art Unit 2603  
SUBJECT : Certificate of Correction Request in Patent No. 5,586,121

A response to the following question(s) is requested with respect to the accompanying request for a certificate of correction.

1. Would the change(s) requested under 37 CFR 1.323 constitute new matter or require reexamination of the application?
2. Would the change(s) requested under 37 CFR 1.323 materially affect the scope or meaning of the claims allowed by the examiner in the patent?
3. Applicant disagrees with change(s) initialed and dated by Examiner in lieu of an Examiner's Amendment. Should the change request be granted?
4. With respect to the change(s) requested, correcting Office errors, should the patent read as shown in the certificate of correction?
5. If the amendment filed \_\_\_\_\_ had been considered by the Examiner, would the amendment have been entered?

PLEASE RESPOND WITHIN 7 DAYS AND RETURN THE FILE TO  
ROOM 809, PKI  
918 PK 3

Trina Smith  
Patent Assistant

TO: CERTIFICATES OF CORRECTION BRANCH

DATE:

The decision regarding the change(s) requested in the certificate of correction is shown below.

1.  YES  NO  Comments below
2.  YES  NO  Comments below
3.  YES  NO  Comments below
4.  YES  NO  Comments below
5.  YES  NO  Comments below

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Jay C*  
Supervisor

2734  
Art Unit